



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,528	12/27/2001	Benjamin N. Eldridge	P6C3-US	2563
50905	7590	03/06/2007	EXAMINER	
N. KENNETH BURRASTON KIRTON & MCCONKIE P.O. BOX 45120 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120			PATEL, PARESH H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/034,528	ELDRIDGE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Paresh Patel	2829	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 43,48,49,51-57,59-65,74-81 and 93-107 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 43,48,49,51-57,59-65,74-81 and 93-107 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued and explained at Exhibit 1 that Littlebury's tested semiconductor device will have irregular scrub marks because Littlebury discloses no mechanism for adjusting an orientation of probes to corresponding terminals of chip (i.e. tested semiconductor device). Examiner, again disagrees because final product (i.e. tested semiconductor device) as claimed does not include the limitation (i.e. uniform scrub marks) that Applicants trying to explain in Exhibit 2. Therefore, Examiner believes that Littlebury does disclose the final product as claimed.

Examiner again disagrees because the claim is directed to the product i.e. "tested semiconductor device", it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the uniform scrub marks as further argued) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Since, Littlebury reference discloses the claimed product and in product-by-process claims, the claims are directed to the product and not the process, arguments about Littlebury reference are not true.

2. With respect to double patenting rejection Applicant argues that Examiner has not identified differences between claims of Eldridge and claims of the instant application. Examiner again disagrees with Applicant because, the final product (i.e.

tested semiconductor device) as claimed, is disclosed by Eldridge at claim 37 with obvious differences in process steps. See rejection below.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 43, 51-52, 54, 56-57, 60-61, 63-65, 74, 77, 80-81, 93-95 and 96 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 43 recites the limitation "probe structure" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Dependent claims are also rejected.

6. **For the purpose of Examination and to expedite the process of prosecution, it is assumed at claim 1 that "probe structure" should read --probe substrate--. It is also assume at claim 1 that "ones" as claimed should read as -- plurality--.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 43, 48-49, 51-57, 59-65, 74-81, 93-107 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Littlebury (US 5012187).

Littlebury anticipated (fig. 2) a tested semiconductor device (12 tested in wafer form, see lines 26-29 of column 2 and lines 40-63 of column 4) produced by providing a wafer (lines 11-16 of column 4, preferred embodiment being wafer form) having a plurality of semiconductor devices thereon, each of the semiconductor devices including a plurality of electrical contact terminals (13) as recited in claim 43.

Regarding claim 48, dicing the wafer to singulate the semiconductor devices is anticipated by Littlebury (lines 11-18 of col. 4).

Littlebury anticipated the limitations of claims 49, 51-57, 59-65 and 74-81 and 93-107, because the additional limitations presented in each claims 49, 51-57, 59-65, 74-81 and 93-107 relies from the process of producing the product and does not further limit the scope of Applicants' claimed invention that is directed solely to "a tested semiconductor device."

9. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Corbett et al. (US 5539324).

Regarding claim 43, Corbett et al. (hereafter Corbett) discloses "The probe tips are planar so that contact to each die pad occurs simultaneously." Therefore, Corbett discloses the tested semiconductor device. Corbett also meets applicants argued uniform scrub marks (not found in the claim) on a tested semiconductor device. A process limitation defines the claimed invention over the prior art to the degree that it defines the product itself. A process limitation cannot serve to patentably distinguish the product over the prior art, in the case that the product is same as, or obvious over the prior art. See Product-by-Process in MPEP § 2113 and 2173.05(p) and *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 43, 48-49, 51-57, 59-65, 74-81 and 93-107 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27 and 35 of U.S. Patent No. US 5,974,662. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims of the instant application, which are directed to the product-by-process and claims of US Pat. 5,974,662 disclose substantially similar subject matter to produce tested semiconductor devices. Here, Eldridge discloses claimed tested semiconductor device. A process limitation defines the claimed invention over the prior art to the degree that it defines the product itself. A process limitation cannot serve to patentably distinguish the product over the prior art, in the case that the product is same as, or obvious over the prior art. See Product-by-Process in MPEP § 2113 and 2173.05(p) and *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paresh Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-1968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Paresh Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2829

March 04, 2007